

Subject: [Fwd: LBC proposed regulations comments]

Date: Wed, 16 May 2001 10:06:06 -0800

From: Dan Bockhorst <dan_bockhorst@dced.state.ak.us>

To: Jennie B Morrison <jennie_morrison@dced.state.ak.us>

Subject: LBC proposed regulations comments

Date: Wed, 16 May 2001 09:28:51 -0800

From: Mary Griswold <mgrt@xyz.net>

To: Dan Bockhorst <dan_bockhorst@dced.state.ak.us>

(comments also attached as a word document)

P.O. Box 1417
Homer, AK 99603
May 16, 2001

Local Boundary Commission
550 West 7th Avenue, Suite 1770
Anchorage, AK 99501-3510

Fax: 907-269-4539

Re: Proposed changes in the LBC regulations

3AAC 110.425 LEGISLATIVE REVIEW ANNEXATION PETITIONS

I enthusiastically support this new section. Public participation in the annexation process should be encouraged from the beginning. Requiring that the petitioner prepare a draft petition and hold a properly noticed public hearing will promote better understanding of the conditions leading to annexation and will provide reasonable opportunity to explore alternatives to annexation before committing the petitioner to his plan.

I was dismayed that Homer's annexation petition was thrust upon us with no opportunity for prior discussion. Having to jump in at the respondent level is expensive (for legal advice) and frustrating (because the positions are adversarial).

It may in fact be in the best interests of the community and the state to annex unwilling people. Giving them full opportunity to explore alternatives and participate in the planning process will give them a better understanding of the situation and help them accept an unwelcome outcome if better choices do not emerge.

The LBC could also require that any city using legislative review annexation have in place an annexation policy.

The State of Washington prepared a handbook about annexation, from which I got most of the following ideas.

I suggest that the city prepare guidelines for the logical direction of future growth and include these in its comprehensive plan. A statement of annexation goals and policies should be developed after the city has considered its goals for growth in light of its ability to provide municipal services to additional areas. The statement of annexation goals could include the following:

Identification of the city's sphere of influence, which will establish boundaries of logical expansion;

Adoption of a meaningful set of goals and policies that will inform citizens and organized groups about the city's position and philosophy concerning annexation;

Development of policies that will benefit residents of both the city and fringe areas;

Provision for departmental staff review and development of cost figures for any area showing qualification for annexation;

Reappraisal of annexation goals and policies on a continuing basis; and

Maintenance of an awareness of the needs and problems that exist within suburban areas.

3 AAC 110 150 LOCAL ACTION addition (4) approval of the combined voters:


Because the balanced best interest of a locality and state may be enhanced by local participation a legislative review petition, the LBC, at its discretion, may convert a legislative review petition to a petition subject to voter approval. This new option provides the LBC another alternative to more equitably resolve contentious situations. In the case of Homer's petition, there is question whether the actions of the city government represent the wishes of the people it serves. A combined vote would provide all the affected people an opportunity to be heard.

I think the combined vote option might also prove valuable on a local action petition initiated by residents of the territory if there were question whether the city residents desired their inclusion.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mary Griswold

 LBC reg change comments 5:16	Name: LBC reg change comments 5:16 Type: Microsoft Word Document (application/msword) Encoding: base64 Description: Unknown Document Download Status: Not downloaded with message
--	--